

From: Todd Papaleo
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/23/02 6:20pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The way Microsoft is imposing its Passport strategy on consumers is not only audacious, but unwelcome. I am a Macintosh user, and I frequently exercise my choice to not use Microsoft products because of several reasons:

They're not necessarily the best, in that they're often burdened with a cumbersome and cryptic interface.

They presume too much (under the guise of assisting the user) about the work I want to accomplish, resulting in wasted time dealing with tedious streams of dialogue boxes and "wizards".

They, in short, dictate how I should interface with my machine to do my work, because they have a prescribed plan, and anyone or anything that doesn't figure in is deemed irrelevant.

It became painfully apparent that there is no escaping Microsoft's .NET strategy when I logged on to their Mac product website to download a trial version of Office v.X for Mac OS X. I was required to create a Passport identity in order to download it. Other users are forced to adopt a Passport identity when registering the full product. If they choose not to, they don't receive the benefits of registration.

This is like saying, "You can run, but you can't hide. And if you run, you'll just die tired. We'll get you." I don't like the fact that even though I am actively avoiding using their products and services, I run into them sooner or later. I now know that if I ever want to use Office X, my Passport will be more important than my actual purchase of the product. I do have a Passport, but I got it two years ago when it made sense to have a Hotmail account. Now, this once innocuous mail service is part of a grander scheme to control my work and my life.

Microsoft consistently imposes their technology on the rest of the world, casting international standards to the wind, under the pretense of making technology better. In actuality, they are assuring their role in the world of technology by instituting new web protocols that fuel their dissemination of the Explorer browser, and the technologies they build into it "for a better user experience". This is but ONE example.

Other companies diligently adhere to international standards of technology in order to make the best products they can. But when a new version or service pack of Windows throws the world a curve ball, they are all forced to catch up or face the consequences. I work on PCs at work, and my computing experience is usually horrible to fair on any

given day, generally because of security holes and malfunctioning Microsoft products that do not allow the average reasonable user enough latitude to know what they're doing or how to remedy a potentially disastrous situation.

Instead of adding features to ensure a "better user experience" (as opposed to a sharp stick in the eye), they ought to concentrate on making a secure and usable product where I don't need a MSCE certificate to set up my mail. I'm surprised that the world has not brought a class-action suit against them for all the pain, suffering and financial catastrophes that have resulted from them not crossing their t's and dotting their I's when they're putting out an operating system. Their reasoning must be it's better to get people's money now, and promise to issue a patch whenever some hacker exposes a blatant security flaw.

If they want 95% of the world, the least they could do is make it so their stuff works as advertised, and doesn't shower the people with promises of a better this and more exciting that. They have great responsibility to us, they are supposed to make it so we want to use their product.

The reality is we're forced to if we want to be in business, and even then our business transactions are constantly at risk because of their lackadaisical approach to security.

The sole purpose of Microsoft is to make money on anything that they become involved with, including internet and computer companies. I don't want them to go away, I just want them to play fair and compete on their own strengths instead of turnignthe tables every 6 months.

Sincerely,
Todd Papaleo